

is as Scoresby wrote it daily, with navigational details, changes of weather and ice, the occasional sighting of fish, and the few catches, as well as the difficulties he faced throughout. In many ways, it was the worst of his many voyages. The advantage of this facsimile is that it allows students to examine those parts of the story that are of special interest.

William Scoresby, Jr., became known for his scientific bent through his papers to the Wernerian Society and his *Arctic Regions*. Here, as they occurred, he observed rain, clouds, the effects of cold, crystals, refraction, the colour of the sea, natural history, and terrestrial magnetism. His Fellowship of the Royal Society was well earned, in a day when for some it was a social distinction.

The Whitby Literary and Philosophical Society have a mass of papers left by Scoresby on his death; they are fortunate in finding a publisher to make these two logs available to readers.

A.G.E. Jones
The Bungalow
Bayhall Road
Tunbridge Wells
Kent TN2 4UB
England

A CLIMATE FOR CHANGE: ALTERNATIVES FOR THE CENTRAL AND EASTERN ARCTIC. By KATHERINE A. GRAHAM, M.P. SHARON BROWN, ANNE B. McALLISTER, and MARGOT J. WOJCIECHOWSKI. Kingston: Queen's University, Institute of Local Government, Centre for Resource Studies, 1984. 184 p.

A Climate for Change is the product of work done from 1980-83 (funded by the Donner Canadian Foundation) by the Eastern Arctic Study research team, based at Queen's University's Centre for (mineral) Resource Studies. The purpose of the book is to "identify ongoing political forces" and to "avoid difficulties." The book suffers from three major problems, which reduce its usefulness significantly. (1) If it is directed at a general audience, nonexperts, there are very important pieces of background that are missing but which are critical if the public is to interpret the document. (2) If it is for experts, there is not enough detail for adequate assessment. (3) Most damning is the explicit exclusion of the two most important factors influencing change in the North: the drive for provincial status and the question of aboriginal title.

The document should state more explicitly that it has a very definite perspective (or bias). It is written with the interests and the perspectives of the mining industry and the federal government in mind. There is very little critical analysis of the roles of the federal government or industry. The document states that it is "inconceivable" that the federal government would give up its ultimate authority concerning ownership of nonrenewable resource and industrial development. Local people (i.e., Northerners) are characterized as not essential and consistent participants, bystanders, and as being mistaken about consultation (i.e., they expect to play an active role). It is not clear whether these statements are descriptive or normative. It is not clear who made them and what they are based upon. There is not the analysis that such statements require. When it is noted that the original co-principal investigator moved from the Centre to assistant deputy minister in Energy, Mines and Resources, that another researcher moved to the National Energy Board, and that two other authors once worked for C.M. Drury, the possible source of the bias becomes clear. Only those who embrace the heartland/hinterland model, which relegates the "outer" provinces and territories to colonial status, could have produced this document. To them it is inconceivable that the federal government's role would be reduced, but they are able to describe a scenario in which the federal government's role would increase.

The federal government/mining industry bias and failure to address topics northerners should be concerned about is evident in the fact that

environmental and social problems are only mentioned. The upheavals of the boom-and-bust nature of the mining industry never come up. Company officials and Ottawa bureaucrats suffer no personal trauma or financial loss when mining communities "die." The report does note that local employment does not seem to reach expectations. It is northerners who will have to live with, or in, pollution left after miners leave.

The book has not addressed the thorny problems of the morality and effectiveness of decisions made in remote areas (i.e., Ottawa) or the issue of maintaining native culture and local values while development proceeds.

The centralist perspective that dominates the book will leave the naive reader from central Canada totally confused when the national news describes what is happening in the North. Citizens of the West or the North will likely be bewildered or enraged.

For the more informed reader the document is frustrating because of its vagueness or lack of attention to detail or to the requirements for an adequate technical report. Methodology is not adequately described. That "... results of the case studies and other analysis were circulated to interested individuals ..." is far too vague. A document dealing with sensitive and controversial issues that leaves untouched two crucial factors (provincial status and aboriginal title) must go much farther than this one in describing and justifying approach and methodology. Why were crucial factors ignored (citing "terms of reference" is not an adequate excuse), and can a useful document be produced under that constraint? Is it at all realistic to include a scenario in which federal (central) power and control increase? Was this included to "balance" the analysis by giving the impression that all possibilities have an equal probability? The document does not display the rigour and objectivity necessary to assist the informed reader in identifying ongoing political forces and in avoiding difficulties.

The document may also do a disservice to its most sympathetic readers, the Centre's clients. If the federal government and the mining industry believe what they read, their actions and attitudes will increase the distrust of Ottawa, and any communications will likely be acrimonious. If readers of this document are reinforced in their beliefs that colonial attitudes are acceptable in the '80s in Canada, that "high grading" of the hinterland is really in the longer term interests of the country, and that some citizens are less equal than others, then tensions, distrust, acrimony, and divisiveness will continue to increase.

Unfortunately, this book will exacerbate rather than help correct the astigmatic myopia that plagues central Canada.

Dixon Thompson
Professor, Environmental Science
Faculty of Environmental Design
The University of Calgary
Calgary, Alberta, Canada
T2N 1N4

THE FROZEN FAMILY FROM THE UTQIAGVIK SITE, BARROW, ALASKA: Papers from a Symposium. Various authors. *Arctic Anthropology* 21(1):1-154.

The objective of this volume is to provide a series of interdisciplinary papers relating to the 1982 excavations of a unique prehistoric arctic archaeological site with remarkable preservation of artifacts, features, and human remains. The site is described as a catastrophically terminated Inupiat winter house and is located at Barrow, Alaska (BAR-2). An ice override is forwarded as the most likely explanation for the disaster, which is interpreted to have occurred between A.D. 1850 and A.D. 1500. This event not only sealed and preserved organic cultural materials, but also trapped and killed five people within the structure. At the time of discovery, two of these individuals still possessed considerable amounts of soft tissues, preserved by the nearly constant frozen conditions. These tissues allowed